

# Generalized multiple depot traveling salesmen problem - polyhedral study and exact algorithm

Kaarthik Sundar<sup>a,\*</sup>, Sivakumar Rathinam<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Graduate Student, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA

<sup>b</sup>Assistant Professor, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA

---

## Abstract

The generalized multiple depot traveling salesmen problem (GMDTSP) is a variant of the multiple depot traveling salesmen problem (MDTSP), where each salesman starts at a distinct depot, the targets are partitioned into clusters and at least one target in each cluster is visited by some salesman. The GMDTSP is an NP-hard problem as it generalizes the MDTSP and has practical applications in design of ring networks, vehicle routing, flexible manufacturing scheduling and postal routing. We present an integer programming formulation for the GMDTSP and valid inequalities to strengthen the linear programming relaxation. Furthermore, we present a polyhedral analysis of the convex hull of feasible solutions to the GMDTSP and derive facet-defining inequalities that strengthen the linear programming relaxation of the GMDTSP. All these results are then used to develop a branch-and-cut algorithm to obtain optimal solutions to the problem. The performance of the algorithm is evaluated through extensive computational experiments on several benchmark instances.

*Keywords:* Generalized multiple depot traveling salesmen, Routing, Branch-and-cut, Polyhedral study

---

## 1. Introduction

The generalized multiple depot travelling salesmen problem (GMDTSP) is an important combinatorial optimization problem that has several practical applications including but not limited to maritime transportation, health-care logistics, survivable telecommunication network design (Bektas et al. (2011)), material flow system design, postbox collection (Laporte et al. (1996)), and routing unmanned vehicles (Manyam et al. (2014); Oberlin et al. (2010)). The GMDTSP is formally defined as follows: let  $D := \{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$  denote the set of depots and  $T$ , the set of targets. We are given a complete undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with vertex set  $V := T \cup D$  and edge set  $E := \{(i, j) : i \in V, j \in T\}$ . In addition, a proper partition  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  of  $T$  is given; these partitions are called *clusters*. For each edge  $(i, j) = e \in E$ , we associate a non-negative

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* kaarthiksundar@tamu.edu (Kaarthik Sundar), srathinam@tamu.edu (Sivakumar Rathinam)

cost  $c_e = c_{ij}$ . The GMDTSP consists of determining a set of at most  $k$  simple cycles such that each cycle starts and ends at a distinct depot, at least one target from each cluster is visited by some cycle and the total cost of the set of cycles is a minimum. The GMDTSP reduces to a multiple depot traveling salesman problem (MDTSP - [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#)) when every cluster is a singleton set. The GMDTSP involves two related decisions:

1. choosing a subset of targets  $S \subseteq T$ , such that  $|S \cap C_h| \geq 1$  for  $h = 1, \dots, m$ ;
2. solving a MDTSP on the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $S \cup D$ .

The GMDTSP can be considered either as a generalization of the MDTSP in [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#) where the targets are partitioned into clusters and at least one target in each cluster has to be visited by some salesman or as a multiple salesmen variant of the symmetric generalized traveling salesman problem (GTSP) in [Fischetti et al. \(1995, 1997\)](#). [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#) and [Fischetti et al. \(1995\)](#) present a polyhedral study of the MDTSP and GTSP polytope respectively, and develop a branch-and-cut algorithm to compute optimal solutions for the respective problem.

This is the first work in the literature that analyzes the facial structure and derives additional valid and facet-defining inequalities for the convex hull of feasible solutions to the GMDTSP. This paper presents a mixed-integer linear programming formulation and develops a branch-and-cut algorithm to solve the problem to optimality. This work generalizes the results of the two aforementioned problems namely the MDTSP ([Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#)) and the GTSP ([Fischetti et al. \(1995\)](#)).

### 1.1. Related work:

A special case of the GMDTSP with one salesman, the symmetric generalized traveling salesman problem (GTSP), was first introduced by [Labordere \(1969\)](#) and [Srivastava et al. \(1969\)](#) in relation to record balancing problems arising in computer design and to the routing of clients through agencies providing various services respectively. Since then, the GTSP has attracted considerable attention in the literature as several variants of the classical traveling salesman problem can be modeled as a GTSP ([Laporte et al. \(1996\)](#); [Feillet et al. \(2005\)](#); [Oberlin et al. \(2009\)](#); [Manyam et al. \(2014\)](#)). [Noon and Bean \(1989\)](#) developed a procedure to transform a GTSP to an asymmetric traveling salesman problem and the [Laporte et al. \(1987\)](#) investigated the asymmetric counterpart of the GTSP. Despite most of the aforementioned applications of the GTSP ([Laporte et al. \(1996\)](#)) extending naturally to their multiple depot variant, there are no exact algorithms in the literature to address the GMDTSP.

A related generalization of the GMDTSP can be found in the vehicle routing problem (VRP) literature. VRPs are capacitated counterparts for the TSPs where the vehicles have a limited capacity and each target is associated with a demand that has to be met by the vehicle visiting that target. The multiple VRPs can be classified based on whether the vehicles start from a single depot or from multiple depots. The

generalized multiple vehicle routing problem (GVRP) is a capacitated version of the GMDTSP with all the vehicles starting from a single depot. [Bektas et al. \(2011\)](#) present four formulations for the GVRP, compare the linear relaxation solutions for them, and develop a branch-and-cut to optimally solve the problem. In [Laporte \(1987\)](#), [Laporte](#) models the GVRP as a location-routing problem. On the contrary, [Ghiani and Imbrota \(2000\)](#) develop an algorithm to transform the GVRP into a capacitated arc routing problem, which therefore enables one to utilize the available algorithms for the latter to solve the former. In a more recent paper, [Bautista et al. \(2008\)](#) study a special case of the GVRP derived from a waste collection application where each cluster contains at most two vertices. The authors describe a number of heuristic solution procedures, including two constructive heuristics, a local search method and an ant colony heuristic to solve several practical instances. To our knowledge, there are no algorithms in the literature to compute optimal solutions to the generalized multiple depot vehicle routing problem or the GMDTSP.

The objective of this paper is to develop an integer programming formulation for the GMDTSP, study the facial structure of the GMDTSP polytope and develop a branch-and-cut algorithm to solve the problem to optimality. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in [Sec. 2](#) we introduce notation and present the integer programming formulation. In [Sec. 3](#), the facial structure of the GMDTSP polytope is studied and its relation to the MDTSP polytope ([Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#)) is established. We also introduce a general theorem that allows one to lift any facet of the MDTSP polytope into a facet of the GMDTSP polytope. We further use this result to develop several classes of facet-defining inequalities for the GMDTSP. In the subsequent sections, the formulation is used to develop a branch-and-cut algorithm to obtain optimal solutions. The performance of the algorithm is evaluated through extensive computational experiments on 116 benchmark instances from the GTSP library ([Gutin and Karapetyan \(2010\)](#)).

## 2. Problem Formulation

We now present a mathematical formulation for the GMDTSP inspired by models in [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#) and [Fischetti et al. \(1995\)](#). We propose a two-index formulation for the GMDTSP. We associate to each feasible solution  $\mathcal{F}$ , a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|E|}$  (a real vector indexed by the elements of  $E$ ) such that the value of the component  $x_e$  associated with edge  $e$  is the number of times  $e$  appears in the feasible solution  $\mathcal{F}$ . Note that for some edges  $e \in E$ ,  $x_e \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  *i.e.*, we allow the degenerate case where a cycle can only consist of a depot and a target. If  $e$  connects two vertices  $i$  and  $j$ , then  $(i, j)$  and  $e$  will be used interchangeably to denote the same edge. Similarly, associated to  $\mathcal{F}$ , is also a vector  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|T|}$ , *i.e.*, a real vector indexed by the elements of  $T$ . The value of the component  $y_i$  associated with a target  $i \in T$  is equal to one if the target  $i$  is visited by a cycle and zero otherwise.

For any  $S \subset V$ , we define  $\gamma(S) = \{(i, j) \in E : i, j \in S\}$  and  $\delta(S) = \{(i, j) \in E : i \in S, j \notin S\}$ . If  $S = \{i\}$ , we simply write  $\delta(i)$  instead of  $\delta(\{i\})$ . We also denote by  $C_{h(v)}$  the cluster containing the target  $v$

and define  $W := \{v \in T : |C_{h(v)}| = 1\}$ . Finally, for any  $\hat{E} \subseteq E$ , we define  $x(\bar{E}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \bar{E}} x_{ij}$ , and for any disjoint subsets  $A, B \subseteq V$ ,  $(A : B) = \{(i, j) \in E : i \in A, j \in B\}$  and  $x(A : B) = \sum_{e \in (A:B)} x_{ij}$ . Using the above notations, the GMDTSP is formulated as a mixed integer linear program as follows:

$$\text{Minimize } \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e \quad (1)$$

subject to

$$x(\delta(i)) = 2y_i \quad \forall i \in T, \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{i \in C_h} y_i \geq 1 \quad \forall h \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad (3)$$

$$x(\delta(S)) \geq 2y_i \quad \forall S \subseteq T, i \in S, \quad (4)$$

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 3x_{jk} + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq 2(y_j + y_k) \quad \forall j, k \in T; D' \subset D, \quad (5)$$

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 2x(\gamma(S \cup \{j, k\})) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq \sum_{v \in S} 2y_v + 2(y_j + y_k) - y_i$$

$$\forall i \in S; j, k \in T, j \neq k; S \subseteq T \setminus \{j, k\}, S \neq \emptyset; D' \subset D, \quad (6)$$

$$x_e \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall e \in \gamma(T), \quad (7)$$

$$x_e \in \{0, 1, 2\} \quad \forall e \in (D : T), \quad (8)$$

$$y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in T. \quad (9)$$

In the above formulation, the constraints in (2) ensure the number edges incident on any vertex  $i \in T$  is equal to 2 if and only if target  $i$  is visited by a cycle ( $y_i = 1$ ). The constraints in (3) force at least one target in each cluster to be visited. The constraints in (4) are the connectivity or sub-tour elimination constraints. They ensure a feasible solution has no sub-tours of any subset of customers in  $T$ . The constraints in (5) and (6) are the path elimination constraints. They do not allow for any cycle in a feasible solution to consist of more than one depot. The validity of these constraints is discussed in the subsection 2.1. Finally, the constraints (7)-(9) are the integrality restrictions on the  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  vectors.

### 2.1. Path elimination constraints:

The first version of the path elimination constraints was developed in the context of location routing problems Laporte et al. (1986). Laporte et al. named these constraints as chain-barring constraints. Authors in Belenguer et al. (2011) and Benavent and Martínez (2013) use similar path elimination constraints for the location routing and the multiple depot traveling salesmen problems. The version of path elimination constraints used in this article is adapted from Sundar and Rathinam (2014). Any path that originates from a depot and visits exactly two customers before terminating at another depot is removed by the constraint in (5). The validity of the constraint (5) can be easily verified as in Laporte et al. (1986); Sundar and Rathinam (2014). Any other path  $d_1, t_1, \dots, t_p, d_2$ , where  $d_1, d_2 \in D$ ,  $t_1, \dots, t_p \in T$  and  $p \geq 3$ , violates

inequality (6) with  $D' = \{d_1\}$ ,  $S = \{t_2, \dots, t_{p-1}\}$ ,  $j = t_1$ ,  $k = t_p$  and  $i = t_r$  where  $2 \leq r \leq p-1$ . The proof of validity of the constraint in Eq. (6) is discussed as a part of the polyhedral analysis of the polytope of feasible solutions to the GMDTSP in the next section (see proposition 3.5).

We note that our formulation allows for a feasible solution with paths connecting two depots and visiting exactly one customer. We refer to such paths as 2-paths. As the formulation allows for two copies of an edge between a depot and a target, 2-paths can be eliminated and therefore there always exists an optimal solution which does not contain any 2-path. In the following subsection, we prove polyhedral results and derive classes of facet-defining inequalities for the model in (2)-(9).

### 3. Polyhedral analysis

In this section we analyse the facial structure of the GMDTSP polytope while leveraging the results already known for the multiple depot traveling salesmen problem (MDTSP).

If the number of targets  $|T| = n$  and the number of depots  $|D| = k$ , then the number of  $x_e$  variables is  $|E| = \binom{n}{2} + nk$  ( $\binom{n}{2}$  is the number of edges between the targets and  $nk$  is the number of edges between targets and depots). Also the number of  $y_i$  variables is  $|T| = n$  and hence, the total number of variables used in the problem formulation is  $|E| + |T| = \binom{n}{2} + nk + n$ . Let  $P$  and  $Q$  denote the GMDTSP and MDTSP as follows:

$$P := \text{conv}\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|E|+|T|} : (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \text{ is a feasible GMDTSP solution}\} \text{ and} \quad (10)$$

$$Q := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in P : y_v = 1 \text{ for all } v \in T\}. \quad (11)$$

The dimension of the polytope  $Q$  was shown to be  $\binom{n}{2} + n(k-1)$  in [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#). To relate the polytopes  $P$  and  $Q$ , we define an intermediate polytope  $P(F)$  as follows:

$$P(F) := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in P : y_v = 1 \text{ for all } v \in F\}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\emptyset \subseteq F \subseteq T$ . Observe that  $P(\emptyset) = P$  and  $P(T) = Q$ . Now, we determine the dimension of the polytope  $P(F)$ . The number of variables in the equation system for  $P(F)$  is  $|E| + |T| = \binom{n}{2} + nk + n$ . The system also includes  $|T| = n$  linear independent equations in (2) and variable fixing equations given by

$$y_v = 1 \text{ for all } v \in F \cup W$$

where,  $W$  is the set of targets that lie in clusters that are singletons (defined in Sec. 2). The following lemma gives the dimension of  $P(F)$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For all  $F \subseteq T$ ,  $\dim(P(F)) = \binom{n}{2} + nk - |F \cup W|$ .*

**Proof** Since the equation system for  $P(F)$  has  $\binom{n}{2} + nk + n$  variables and  $n + |F \cup W|$  linear independent

equality constraints, the  $\dim(P(F)) \leq \binom{n}{2} + nk - |F \cup W|$ . We claim that  $P(F)$  contains  $\binom{n}{2} + nk - |F \cup W| + 1$  affine independent points. The claim proves  $\dim(P(F)) \geq \binom{n}{2} + nk - |F \cup W|$ . Hence, the lemma follows. We prove the claim by induction on the cardinality of the set  $F$ .

For the base case, we have  $F = T$  and  $P(T) = Q$  where  $Q$  is the the MDTSP polytope. Since  $\dim(Q) = \binom{n}{2} + nk - n$  (Benavent and Martínez (2013)), there are  $\binom{n}{2} + nk - n + 1$  affine independent points in  $Q$ . Assume that the claim holds for a set  $F_i$  with  $|F_i| = i$  and  $i > 0$ , and consider a subset of targets  $F_{i-1}$  such that  $|F_{i-1}| = i - 1$ . Let  $v$  be any target not in  $F_{i-1}$ , and define  $F_i := F_{i-1} \cup \{v\}$ . The induction hypothesis provides  $\binom{n}{2} + nk - |F_i \cup W| + 1$  affine independent points belonging to  $P(F_i)$  and hence, to  $P(F_{i-1})$  (since  $P(F_i) \subseteq P(F_{i-1})$ ). If  $v \in W$ , then  $|F_{i-1} \cup W| = |F_i \cup W|$  and we are done. Otherwise,  $|F_{i-1} \cup W| = |F_i \cup W| - 1$  and we need an additional point on the polytope  $P(F_{i-1})$  that is affine independent with the rest of the  $\mathcal{L} = \binom{n}{2} + nk - |F_i \cup W| + 1$  points. All these  $\mathcal{L}$  points satisfy the equation  $y_v = 1$ . An additional point that is affine independent with the  $\mathcal{L}$  points always exists and is given by any feasible MDTSP solution in the subgraph induced by the set of vertices  $(T \cup D) \setminus \{v\}$  because, any feasible MDTSP solution on the set of vertices  $(T \cup D) \setminus \{v\}$  satisfies  $y_v = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.1.**  $\dim(P) = \binom{n}{2} + nk - |W|$ .

Lemma 3.1 indicates that for any given subset  $F \subseteq T$  and  $v \in F$ , either  $\dim(P(F \setminus \{v\})) = \dim(P(F))$  (if  $v \in W$ ) or  $\dim(P(F \setminus \{v\})) = \dim(P(F)) + 1$  (when  $v \notin W$ ) *i.e.*, the dimension of the polytope  $P(F)$  increases by at most one unit when a target is removed from  $F$ . Hence, we can lift any facet-defining valid inequality for  $P(F)$  to be facet-defining for  $P(F \setminus \{v\})$ . In the ensuing proposition, we introduce a result based on the sequential lifting for zero-one programs (Padberg (1975)) which we will use to lift facets of  $Q$  into facets of  $P$ . The proposition generalizes a similar result in Fischetti et al. (1995) used to lift facets of the travelling salesman problem to facets of GTSP.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Suppose that for any  $F \subseteq T$  and  $u \in F$ ,*

$$\sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e x_e + \sum_{v \in T} \beta_v (1 - y_v) \geq \eta$$

*is any facet-defining inequality for  $P(F)$ . Then the lifted inequality*

$$\sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e x_e + \sum_{v \in T \setminus \{u\}} \beta_v (1 - y_v) + \bar{\beta}_u (1 - y_u) \geq \eta$$

*is valid and facet-defining for  $P(F \setminus \{u\})$ , where  $\bar{\beta}_u$  takes an arbitrary value when  $u \in W$  and*

$$\bar{\beta}_u = \eta - \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e x_e + \sum_{v \in T \setminus \{u\}} \beta_v (1 - y_v) : (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in P(F \setminus \{u\}), y_u = 0 \right\}$$

when  $u \notin W$ . Note that the statement can be trivially modified to deal with “ $\leq$ ” inequalities.

**Proof** The proof follows from the sequential lifting theorem in [Padberg \(1975\)](#). □

Proposition 3.1 is used to derive facet-defining inequalities for the GMDTSP polytope  $P$  by lifting the facet-defining inequalities for the MDTSP polytope  $Q$  in [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#). For a given lifting sequence of the set of targets  $T$ , say  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ , the procedure is iteratively applied to derive a facet of  $P(\{v_{t+1}, \dots, v_n\})$  from a facet of  $P(\{v_t, \dots, v_n\})$  for  $t = 1, \dots, n$ . Different lifting sequences produce different facets; hence the name, *sequence dependent* lifting. In the rest of the section, we use the lifting procedure to check if the constraints in (2)-(9) are facet-defining and derive additional facet-defining inequalities for the GMDTSP polytope.

**Proposition 3.2.** *The following results hold for the GMDTSP polytope  $P$ :*

1.  $x_e \geq 0$  defines a facet for every  $e \in E$  if  $|T| \geq 4$ ,
2.  $x_e \leq 1$  defines a facet if and only if  $e \in \gamma(W)$  and  $|T| \geq 3$ ,
3.  $x_e \leq 2$  does not define a facet for any  $e \in (D : T)$ ,
4.  $y_i \geq 0$  does not define a facet for any  $i \in T$ ,
5.  $y_i \leq 1$  defines a facet if and only if  $i \notin W$ , and
6.  $\sum_{i \in C_h} y_i \geq 1$  does not define a facet for any  $h \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

**Proof** We use the facet-defining results of the MDTSP polytope ([Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#)) in conjunction with Proposition 3.1 to prove (1)–(3).

1. Observe that for every  $e \in E$ ,  $x_e \geq 0$  defines a facet of the MDTSP polytope  $Q$  if  $|T| \geq 4$ . Now for any lifting sequence, Proposition 3.1 produces  $\bar{\beta}_v = 0$  for all  $v \in T$  and the result follows.
2. Suppose that  $e = (i, j)$ . If  $i, j \in W$  and  $|T| \geq 3$ , then the claim follows from the forthcoming Proposition 3.3 by choosing  $S = \{i, j\}$ . Otherwise if  $e = (i, j) \in \gamma(T)$ , then  $x_e \leq 1$  is dominated by  $x_e \leq y_i$  if  $i \notin W$  and  $x_e \leq y_j$  if  $j \notin W$ .
3. Let  $e = (d, i)$  where  $d \in D, i \in T$ .  $x_e \leq 2$  defines a face of the MDTSP polytope  $Q$ . Hence neither of the lifted versions of the inequality *i.e.*,  $x_e \leq 2$  (if  $i \in W$ ) or  $x_e \leq 2y_i$  (if  $i \notin W$ ) defines a facet of  $P$ .
4. The inequality  $y_i \geq \frac{1}{2}x_e$  for  $e \in \delta(i)$  dominates  $y_i \geq 0$ . Hence,  $y_i \geq 0$  does not define a facet for any  $i \in T$ .
5. Observe that the valid inequality  $y_i \leq 1$  induces a face,  $P(\{i\}) = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in P : y_i = 1\}$  of  $P$ . From the Lemma 3.1,  $\dim(P(\{i\})) = \dim(P) - 1$  if and only if  $i \notin W$ . Hence,  $y_i \leq 1$  is facet-defining for  $P$  if and only if  $i \notin W$ . When  $i \in W$ , the inequality defines an improper face.

6. The constraint  $\sum_{i \in C_h} y_i \geq 1$  can be reduced to  $\sum_{e \in \delta(C_h)} x_e + 2 \sum_{e \in \gamma(C_h)} x_e \geq 2$  using the degree constraints in (2). When  $\gamma(C_h) \neq \emptyset$ , the constraint  $\sum_{e \in \delta(C_h)} x_e + 2 \sum_{e \in \gamma(C_h)} x_e \geq 2$  is dominated by  $\sum_{e \in \delta(C_h)} x_e \geq 2$ . When  $\gamma(C_h) = \emptyset$  (i.e.,  $|C_h| = 1$ ), the constraint  $\sum_{e \in \delta(C_h)} x_e = 2$  is satisfied by any feasible solution in  $P$  and hence in this case, it is an improper face. Therefore,  $\sum_{i \in C_h} y_i \geq 1$  does not define a facet for any  $h \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .  $\square$

In the next proposition, we prove that the sub-tour elimination constraints in Eq. (4) define facets of  $P$ . To do so, we apply the lifting procedure in Proposition 3.1 to the MDTSP sub-tour elimination constraints

$$x(\delta(S)) \geq 2 \text{ for all } S \subseteq T.$$

In the process, we derive alternate versions of the sub-tour elimination constraints in Eq. (4) which we will refer to as the generalized sub-tour elimination constraints (GSEC). To begin with, we observe that sub-tour elimination constraints given above define facets of the MDTSP polytope  $Q$  when  $|T| \geq 3$  (see Benavent and Martínez (2013)).

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $S \subseteq T$  and  $|T| \geq 3$ . Then the following Generalized Sub-tour Elimination Constraint (GSEC) is valid and facet-defining for  $P$ :*

$$x(\delta(S)) + \bar{\beta}_i(1 - y_i) \geq 2 \text{ for } i \in S,$$

where

$$\bar{\beta}_i = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } \mu(S) = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$\mu(S)$  is defined as  $\mu(S) = |\{h : C_h \subseteq S\}|$ .

**Proof** We first observe that the inequality  $x(\delta(S)) \geq 2$  with  $S \subseteq T$  and  $|T| \geq 3$  defines a facet for the MDTSP polytope. We lift this inequality using the lifting procedure in Proposition 3.1. Let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be any lifting sequence of the set of targets such that  $v_n = i$ . The lifting coefficients  $\bar{\beta}_{v_t}$  are computed iteratively for  $t = 1, \dots, n$ . For  $t = 1, \dots, n - 1$ , it is trivial to see that  $\bar{\beta}_{v_t} = 0$ . Hence,  $x(\delta(S)) \geq 2$  defines a facet of  $P(\{v_n\})$ . As to  $\bar{\beta}_{v_n}$ , we compute its value by performing the lifting procedure again and obtain a facet of  $P$ . We have

$$\bar{\beta}_{v_n} = 2 - \min \{x(\delta(S)) : (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in P, \text{ and } y_{v_n} = 0\}.$$

Solving for  $\bar{\beta}_{v_n}$  using the above equation, we obtain  $\bar{\beta}_{v_n} = 2$  if a feasible GMDTSP solution visiting no target in  $S$  exists (i.e., no  $C_h \subseteq S$  exists) and  $\bar{\beta}_{v_n} = 0$  otherwise.  $\square$

In summary, the Proposition 3.3 results in the following facet-defining inequalities of  $P$ : suppose  $S \subseteq T$

with  $|T| \geq 3$ . Then,

$$x(\delta(S)) \geq 2 \text{ for } \mu(S) \neq 0 \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$x(\delta(S)) \geq 2y_i \text{ for } \mu(S) = 0, i \in S. \quad (14)$$

Note that the inequality  $x(\delta(S)) \geq 2y_i$  is valid for any  $S \subseteq T$ . It is facet-defining for  $P$  only when  $\mu(S) \neq 0$ . When  $\mu(S) = 0$  it does not define a facet of  $P$  as it is dominated by Eq. (13). Using the degree constraints in Eq. (2), the above GSECs can be rewritten as

$$x(\gamma(S)) \leq \sum_{v \in S} y_v - 1 \text{ for } \mu(S) \neq 0 \text{ and} \quad (15)$$

$$x(\gamma(S)) \leq \sum_{v \in S \setminus \{i\}} y_v \text{ for } \mu(S) = 0, i \in S. \quad (16)$$

In the forthcoming two propositions, we prove that the path elimination constraints in Eq. (5) and (6) are facet-defining for  $P$  using Proposition 3.1. The corresponding path elimination constraints for the MDTSP polytope  $Q$  are as follows: suppose that  $j, k \in T$ ,  $D' \subset D$  with  $D' \neq \emptyset$ , then

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 3x_{jk} + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq 4 \quad (17)$$

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 2x(\gamma(S \cup \{j, k\})) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq 2|S| + 3 \text{ for } S \subseteq T \setminus \{j, k\}, S \neq \emptyset \quad (18)$$

We remark that Eq. (17) and (18) define facets for the MDTSP polytope  $Q$  (see Benavent and Martínez (2013)).

**Proposition 3.4.** *Suppose  $j, k \in T$  and  $D' \subset D$  with  $D' \neq \emptyset$ . Then the following path elimination constraint is valid and facet-defining for  $P$ :*

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 3x_{jk} + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') + \bar{\beta}_j(1 - y_j) + \bar{\beta}_k(1 - y_k) \leq 4$$

where  $\bar{\beta}_j = \bar{\beta}_k = 2$ .

**Proof** Let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be any lifting sequence of the set of targets such that  $v_{n-1} = j$  and  $v_n = k$ . The lifting coefficients are iteratively computed for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Coefficients  $\bar{\beta}_v$  for  $v \in \{v_1, \dots, v_{n-2}\}$  are easily computed (tight GMDTSP solution is depicted in Fig. 1(a), showing that the value of  $\bar{\beta}_v$  cannot be increased without producing a violated inequality). Similarly for  $t = n - 1$  i.e.,  $v_t = j$ , the correctness of the coefficient  $\bar{\beta}_j = 2$  can be checked with the help of Fig. 1(b). Analogously, we obtain  $\bar{\beta}_k = 2$ .  $\square$

The inequality in Proposition 3.4 can be rewritten as  $x(D' : \{j\}) + 3x_{jk} + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq 2(y_j + y_k)$  which is the path elimination constraint in Eq. (5). We have proved that this inequality is valid and defines a facet of  $P$ .



Figure 1: Tight feasible solutions for proof of Proposition 3.4. The vertices  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are depots and  $j, k$ , and  $v$  are targets.




Figure 2: Tight feasible solutions for proof of Proposition 3.5.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $j, k \in T$ ,  $D' \subset D$ ,  $S \subseteq T \setminus \{j, k\}$  and  $i \in S$  such that  $D' \neq \emptyset$  and  $S \neq \emptyset$ . Also let  $\bar{S} = S \cup \{j, k\}$ . Then the following Generalized Path Elimination Constraint (PSEC) is valid and facet-defining for  $P$ :*

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 2x(\gamma(\bar{S})) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') + \sum_{v \in T} \bar{\beta}_v(1 - y_v) \leq 2|S| + 3$$

where

$$\bar{\beta}_v = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in T \setminus \bar{S}, \\ 2 & \text{if } v \in \bar{S} \setminus \{i\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } v = i \text{ and } \mu(S) = 0, \\ 2 & \text{if } v = i \text{ and } \mu(S) \neq 0; \end{cases}$$

$\mu(S)$  is defined as  $\mu(S) = |\{h : C_h \subseteq S\}|$ .

**Proof** Consider any lifting sequence of the set of targets  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  such that each target in the set  $S \setminus \{i\}$  follows all the targets in the set  $|T \setminus \bar{S}|$  and  $v_{n-2} = j$ ,  $v_{n-1} = k$  and  $v_n = i$ . The coefficients  $\bar{\beta}_v = 0$  for  $v \in T \setminus \bar{S}$  and  $\bar{\beta}_v = 2$  for  $v \in S \setminus \{i\}$  are trivial to compute (tight GMDTSP solution is depicted in Fig. 2(a) and 2(b) respectively, showing that the value of  $\bar{\beta}_v$  cannot be increased without producing a violated inequality). The correctness of coefficients  $\bar{\beta}_j = 2$  and  $\bar{\beta}_k = 2$  can be checked with the help of Fig. 2(c) and 2(d), respectively.

It remains to compute the value of coefficient  $\bar{\beta}_i$ . For computing  $\bar{\beta}_i$ , we have to take into account for the possibility of a GMDTSP solution not visiting any target in the set  $S$ . This can happen when  $\mu(S) = 0$ . In this case, we obtain  $\bar{\beta}_i = 1$ ; see Fig. 2(e). Likewise, when  $\mu(S) \neq 0$ , any GMDTSP solution has to have at least two edges in  $\delta(S)$ . This leads to  $\bar{\beta}_i = 2$ ; tight GMDTSP solution is shown in Fig. 2(f).  $\square$

In summary, the Proposition 3.5 results in the following facet-defining inequalities of  $P$ : suppose  $j, k \in T$ ,  $D' \subset D$ ,  $S \subseteq T \setminus \{j, k\}$ ,  $\bar{S} = S \cup \{j, k\}$  and  $i \in S$  such that  $D' \neq \emptyset$  and  $S \neq \emptyset$ , then

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 2x(\gamma(\bar{S})) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq \sum_{v \in \bar{S}} 2y_v - y_i \text{ for } \mu(S) = 0 \text{ and} \quad (19)$$

$$x(D' : \{j\}) + 2x(\gamma(\bar{S})) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq \sum_{v \in \bar{S}} 2y_v - 1 \text{ for } \mu(S) \neq 0. \quad (20)$$

We note that the above PSECs can be rewritten in cut-set form as

$$x(\delta(\bar{S})) \geq x(D' : \{j\}) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') + y_i \text{ for } \mu(S) = 0 \text{ and} \quad (21)$$

$$x(\delta(\bar{S})) \geq x(D' : \{j\}) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') + 1 \text{ for } \mu(S) \neq 0. \quad (22)$$

As we will see in the forthcoming section, the GPECs in the above form are more amicable for developing

separation algorithms. Next, we examine the comb inequalities that are valid and facet-defining for the MDTSP polytope. These inequalities were initially introduced for the TSP in [Chvátal \(1973\)](#). These inequalities were extended and proved to be facet-defining for the MDTSP polytope in [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#). We define a comb inequality using a comb, which is a family  $C = (H, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_t)$  of  $t + 1$  subsets of the targets;  $t$  is an odd number and  $t \geq 3$ . The subset  $H$  is called the handle and the subsets  $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_t$  are called teeth. The handle and teeth satisfy the following conditions:

- i.  $H \cap \mathcal{T}_i \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t,$
- ii.  $\mathcal{T}_i \setminus H \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t,$
- iii.  $\mathcal{T}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_j = \emptyset \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq t.$

The conditions i. and ii. indicate that every tooth  $\mathcal{T}_i$  intersects the handle  $H$  and the condition iii. indicates that no two teeth intersect. We define the size of  $C$  as  $\sigma(C) := |H| + \sum_{i=1}^t |\mathcal{T}_i| - \frac{3t+1}{2}$ . Then the comb inequality associated with  $C$  is given by

$$x(\gamma(H)) + \sum_{i=1}^t x(\gamma(\mathcal{T}_i)) \leq \sigma(C) \quad (23)$$

The inequality in Eq. 23 is valid and facet-defining for the MDTSP (see [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#)). A special case of the comb inequality, called *2-matching* inequality is obtained when  $|\mathcal{T}_i| = 2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ . In the case of a 2-matching inequality, the size of the comb is  $\sigma(C) = |H| + \frac{t+1}{2}$ . We apply the lifting procedure in Proposition 3.1 to the inequality in (23) and obtain facet-defining inequality for the GMDTSP. The following proposition is adapted from [Fischetti et al. \(1995\)](#); the proof of the proposition is omitted as it is similar to the proof of the corresponding theorem for GTSP in [Fischetti et al. \(1995\)](#).

**Proposition 3.6.** *Suppose  $\mu(S) = |\{h : C_h \subseteq S\}|$  for  $S \subseteq T$  and let  $C = (H, \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_t)$  be a comb. For  $i = 1, \dots, t$ , let  $a_i$  be any target in  $\mathcal{T}_i \cap H$  if  $\mu(\mathcal{T}_i \cap H) = 0$ ;  $a_i = 0$  (a dummy value) otherwise; and let  $b_i$  be any target in  $\mathcal{T}_i \setminus H$  if  $\mu(\mathcal{T}_i \setminus H) = 0$ ;  $b_i = 0$  otherwise. Then the following comb inequality is valid and facet-defining for the GMDTSP polytope  $P$ :*

$$x(\gamma(H)) + \sum_{i=1}^t x(\gamma(\mathcal{T}_i)) + \sum_{v \in T} \bar{\beta}_v (1 - y_v) \leq \sigma(C), \quad (24)$$

where  $\bar{\beta}_v = 0$  for all  $v \in T \setminus (H \cup \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t)$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_v = 1$  for all  $v \in H \setminus (\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t)$  and for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}_v &= 2 && \text{for } v \in \mathcal{T}_i \cap H, v \neq a_i; \\ \bar{\beta}_{a_i} &= 1 && \text{if } a_i \neq 0; \\ \bar{\beta}_v &= 1 && \text{for } v \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus H, v \neq b_i; \\ \bar{\beta}_{b_i} &= 0 && \text{if } b_i \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof** See [Fischetti et al. \(1995\)](#). □

### 3.1. Additional valid inequalities specific to multiple depot problems

In this section, we will examine a special type of comb inequality called the T-comb inequalities. The T-comb inequalities were introduced in [Benavent and Martínez \(2013\)](#) and proved to be valid and facet-defining for the MDTSP polytope. These inequalities are specific to problems involving multiple depots and hence, are important for the GMDTSP. A T-comb inequality  $C$  is defined by an handle  $H$  and teeth  $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_t$  such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- i.  $H \cap \mathcal{T}_i \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t,$
- ii.  $\mathcal{T}_i \setminus H \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t,$
- iii.  $\mathcal{T}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_j = \emptyset \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq t,$
- iv.  $\mathcal{T}_i \cap D \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, t,$
- v.  $H \subset T,$
- vi.  $H \setminus \cup_{i=1}^t \mathcal{T}_i \neq \emptyset,$
- vii.  $D \setminus \cup_{i=1}^t \mathcal{T}_i \neq \emptyset.$

The difference between the T-comb inequalities and the comb inequalities defined in Eq. (23) is that, the number of teeth are allowed to be even ( $t \geq 1$ ) and each teeth must contain a depot. The comb size in this case is given by  $\sigma(C) = |H| + \sum_{i=1}^t |\mathcal{T}_i| - (t+1)$ . In this paper, we will only examine the T-comb inequalities with  $|\mathcal{T}_i| = 2$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ ; the size of the comb in this case reduces to  $\sigma(C) = |H| + t - 1$  and the corresponding T-comb inequality is given by

$$x(\gamma(H)) + \sum_{i=1}^t x(\gamma(\mathcal{T}_i)) \leq |H| + t - 1, \quad (25)$$

The inequality in Eq. (25) is valid and facet-defining for the MDTSP when  $t \geq 2$ . Again, we apply the lifting procedure in Proposition 3.1 to the inequality in (25) and obtain facet-defining inequality for the GMDTSP.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $C = (H, \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_t)$  be a T-comb with  $|\mathcal{T}_i| = 2$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  and  $t \geq 2$ . Also suppose  $|H \setminus \cup_i \mathcal{T}_i| > 1$  (the proposition can be trivially extended to the case where  $|H \setminus \cup_i \mathcal{T}_i| = 1$ ). Let  $\bar{a}$  be any target in  $H \setminus \cup_i \mathcal{T}_i$ . Then the following T-comb inequality is valid and facet-defining for the GMDTSP polytope  $P$ :*

$$x(\gamma(H)) + \sum_{i=1}^t x(\gamma(\mathcal{T}_i)) + \sum_{v \in T} \bar{\beta}_v (1 - y_v) \leq |H| + t - 1, \quad (26)$$

where  $\bar{\beta}_v = 0$  for all  $v \in T \setminus (H \cup \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t)$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_v = 1$  for all  $v \in H \setminus (\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t \cup \{\bar{a}\})$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_{\bar{a}} = 0$ , and  $\bar{\beta}_v = 2$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{T}_i \cap H, i = 1, \dots, t$ .




Figure 3: Tight feasible solutions for proof of Proposition 3.7.

**Proof** Consider any lifting sequence for the set of targets  $T$  in the following order: (i) targets in the set  $T \setminus (H \cup \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t)$ , (ii)  $v \in H \setminus (\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t \cup \{\bar{a}\})$ , (iii)  $\bar{a}$ , and (iv)  $v \in \mathcal{T}_i \cap H, i = 1, \dots, t$ . The lifting coefficients  $\bar{\beta}_v = 0$  and  $\bar{\beta}_v = 1$  for the sets in (i) and (ii) respectively, are trivial to compute (tight feasible GMDTSP solutions are depicted in Fig. 3(a) and 3(b), respectively). Similarly, tight feasible GMDTSP solutions for the cases where  $\bar{\beta}_{\bar{a}} = 0$  and  $\bar{\beta}_v = 2$  (cases (iii) and (iv)) are shown in Fig. 3(c) and 3(d), respectively.  $\square$

In the above proposition, for the case when  $|H \setminus \cup_i \mathcal{T}_i| = 1$ , the facet-defining inequality is given by

$$x(\gamma(H)) + \sum_{i=1}^t x(\gamma(\mathcal{T}_i)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{v \in H \cap \mathcal{T}_i} 2y_v. \quad (27)$$

## 4. Separation algorithms

In this section, we discuss the algorithms that are used to find violated families of all the valid inequalities introduced in Sec. 3. We denote by  $G^* = (V^*, E^*)$  the *support graph* associated with a given fractional solution  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{|E| \cup |T|}$  i.e.,  $G^*$  is a capacitated undirected graph with vertex set  $V^* := \{i \in T : y_i^* > 0\} \cup D$  and  $E^* := \{e \in E : x_e^* > 0\}$  with edge capacities  $x_e^*$  for each edge  $e \in E^*$ .

### 4.1. Separation of generalized sub-tour elimination constraints in Eq. (13) and Eq. (14):

We first develop a separation algorithm for constraints in Eq. (14):  $x(\delta(S)) \geq 2y_i$  for  $\mu(S) = 0, i \in S$  and  $S \subseteq T$ . Given a fractional solution  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ , the most violated constraint of the form (14) can be obtained by computing a minimum capacity cut  $(S, V^* \setminus S)$  with  $i \in S$  and  $D \subseteq V^* \setminus S$  on the graph  $G^*$ . The minimum capacity cut can be obtained by computing a maximum flow from  $i$  to  $t$ , where  $t$  is an additional

vertex connected with each depot in the set  $D$  through an edge having very large capacity. The algorithm is repeated for every target  $i \in T \cap V^*$  and the target set  $S$  obtained during each run of the algorithm defines a violated inequality if the capacity of the cut is strictly less than  $2y_i^*$ . This procedure can be implemented in  $O(|T|^4)$  time.

Now we consider the constraint in Eq. (13):  $x(\delta(S)) \geq 2$  for  $\mu(S) \neq 0$  and  $S \subseteq T$ . Given a fractional solution  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ , the most violated inequality (13) in this case is obtained by computing a minimum capacity cut  $(S, V^* \setminus S)$  with a cluster  $C_h \subseteq S$  and  $D \subseteq V^* \setminus S$  on the graph  $G^*$ . This is in turn achieved by computing a maximum  $s - t$  flow on  $G^*$ , where  $s$  and  $t$  are additional vertices connected with each  $j \in C_h$  and each  $d \in D$  respectively through an edge having very large capacity. The algorithm is repeated for every cluster  $C_h$  and the set  $S$  obtained on each run of the algorithm defines a violated inequality if the capacity of the cut is strictly less than 2. The time complexity of this procedure is  $O(m|T|^3)$ , where  $m$  is the number of clusters.

We remark that the violated inequality of the form (14) using the above algorithm, is not necessarily facet-defining as the set  $S$  computed using the algorithm might have  $\mu(S) \neq 0$ . When this happens, we reject the inequality in favour of its dominating and facet-defining inequality in Eq. (13).

#### 4.2. Separation of path elimination constraints in Eq. (5), (19), and (20):

We first discuss the procedure to separate violated constraints in Eq. (5). Consider every pair of targets  $j, k \in V^* \cap T$ . We rewrite the constraint in (5) as  $x(D' : \{j\}) + x(\{k\} : D \setminus D') \leq 2(y_k + y_j) - 3x_{jk}$ . Given  $j, k$  and a fractional solution  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ , the RHS of the above inequality is a constant and is equal to  $2(y_k^* + y_j^*) - 3x_{jk}^*$ . We observe that the LHS of the inequality is maximized when  $D' = \{d \in D : x_{jd}^* \geq x_{kd}^*\}$ . Furthermore, when  $D' = \emptyset$  or  $D' = D$ , no path constraint in Eq. (5) is violated for the given pair of vertices. With  $D' = \{d \in D : x_{jd}^* \geq x_{kd}^*\}$ , if  $x^*(D' : \{j\}) + x^*(\{k\} : D \setminus D')$  is strictly greater than  $2(y_k^* + y_j^*) - 3x_{jk}^*$ , the path constraint in Eq. (5) is violated for the pair of vertices  $j, k$  and the subset of depots  $D'$ . This procedure can be implemented in  $O(|T|^2)$ .

For constraints in Eq. (19) and (20), we present two separation algorithms that are very similar to the algorithms presented in Sec. 4.1. We will use the equivalent constraints in Eq. (21) and (22) to develop the algorithms. We first consider the path elimination constraint in Eq. (22). Given  $j, k$  and a fractional solution  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ , we first compute  $D'$  to maximize  $x^*(D' : \{j\}) + x^*(\{k\} : D \setminus D') := \mathcal{L}$ . Now, the most violated constraint of the form (22) can be obtained by computing a minimum capacity cut  $(\bar{S}, V^* \setminus \bar{S})$  with  $j, k \in \bar{S}$ , a cluster  $C_h \subseteq \bar{S} \setminus \{j, k\}$  and  $D \subseteq V^* \setminus \bar{S}$ . This algorithm is repeated for every target  $j, k \in T$  and cluster  $C_h$  such that  $j, k \notin C_h$  and the target set  $S = \bar{S} \setminus \{j, k\}$  obtained during each run of the algorithm defines a violated inequality if the capacity of the cut is strictly less than  $\mathcal{L} + 1$ . The time complexity of this algorithm is  $O(m|T|^4)$ . Similarly, the most violated constraint of the form (21) can be obtained by computing a minimum capacity cut  $(\bar{S}, V^* \setminus \bar{S})$ , with  $i, j, k \in \bar{S}$  and  $D \subseteq V^* \setminus \bar{S}$  on the graph  $G^*$ . This

algorithm is repeated for every triplet of targets in  $V^*$  and the set  $S = \bar{S} \setminus \{j, k\}$  defines a violated inequality if the capacity of the cut is strictly less than  $\mathcal{L} + y_i^*$ . The time complexity of the algorithm is  $O(|T|^5)$ .

Similar to the separation of the sub-tour elimination constraints, we remark that the violated inequality of the form (21), computed using the above algorithm is not necessarily facet-defining as the set  $S$  might have  $\mu(S) \neq 0$ . When this happens, we reject the inequality in favour of its dominating and facet-defining inequality in Eq. (22).

#### 4.3. Separation of comb inequalities in Eq. (24)

For the comb-inequalities in Eq. (24), we use the separation procedures discussed in Fischetti et al. (1997). We first consider the special case of the comb inequalities with  $|\mathcal{T}_i| = 2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, t$  i.e., the 2-matching inequalities. Using a construction similar to the one proposed in Padberg and Rao (1982) for the  $b$ -matching problem, the separation problem for the 2-matching inequalities can be transformed into a minimum capacity off cut problem; hence this separation problem is exactly solvable in polynomial time. But this procedure is computationally intensive, and so we use the following heuristic proposed by Grötschel and Padberg (1985). Given a fractional solution  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ , the heuristic considers a graph  $\bar{G} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$  where  $\bar{V} = V^* \cap T$  and  $\bar{E} = \{e : 0 < x_e^* < 1\}$ . Then, we consider each connected component  $H$  of  $\bar{G}$  as a handle of a possibly violated 2-matching inequality whose two-vertex teeth correspond to edges  $e \in \delta(H)$  with  $x_e^* = 1$ . We reject the inequality if the number of teeth is even. The time complexity of this algorithm is  $O(|\bar{V}| + |\bar{E}|)$ . As for the comb inequalities, we apply the same procedure after shrinking each cluster into a single supernode.

#### 4.4. Separation of $T$ -comb inequalities in Eq. (26) and (27)

We present a separation heuristic similar to the one used in Benavent and Martínez (2013) to identify violated  $T$ -comb inequalities of the form Eq. (26) and (27). We first build a set of teeth, each containing a distinct depot according to the following procedure: a tooth  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is built by starting with a set containing a depot  $d \in D$ ; a target  $v \in T$  is added to  $\mathcal{T}_i$  such that  $x(\delta(\mathcal{T}_i))$  is a minimum. Then, for every subset of this set of teeth such that: (i) they are pairwise disjoint, (ii) belong to the same connected component of the support graph  $G^* = (V^*, E^*)$ , and (iii) do not together contain all the targets of that connected component, an appropriate handle  $H$  is built as follows: assume  $H$  is the set of all the targets in the connected component and remove the targets in  $H \setminus (\mathcal{T}_i \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_t)$  sequentially. Every time a target is removed, the  $T$ -comb inequality of the appropriate form is checked for violation. The time complexity of this algorithm is  $O(|T|)$ .

## 5. Branch-and-cut algorithm

In this section, we describe important implementation details of the branch-and-cut algorithm for the GMDTSP. The algorithm is implemented within a CPLEX 12.4 framework using the CPLEX callback

functions [IBM ILOG CPLEX \(2012\)](#). The callback functions in CPLEX enable the user to completely customize the branch-and-cut algorithm embedded into CPLEX, including the choice of node to explore in the enumeration tree, the choice of branching variable, the separation and the addition of user-defined cutting planes and the application of heuristic methods.

The lower bound at the root node of the enumeration tree is computed by solving the LP relaxation of the formulation in [Sec. 2](#) that is further strengthened using the cutting planes described in [Sec. 3](#). The initial linear program consisted of all constraints in [\(1\)-\(9\)](#), except [\(4\)](#), [\(5\)](#) and [\(6\)](#). For a given LP solution, we identify violated inequalities using the separation procedures detailed in [Sec. 4](#) in the following order: (i) sub-tour elimination constraints in [Eq. \(13\)](#), (ii) sub-tour elimination constraints in [Eq. \(14\)](#) (iii) path elimination constraints in [Eq. \(5\)](#), [\(19\)](#) and, [\(20\)](#), (iv) generalized comb constraints in [Eq. \(24\)](#), and (v) T-comb constraints in [Eq. \(26\)](#) and [\(27\)](#). This order of adding the constraints to the formulation was chosen after performing extensive computational experiments. Furthermore, we disabled the separation of all the cuts embedded into the CPLEX framework because enabling these cuts increased the average computation time for the instances. Once the new cuts generated using these separation procedures were added to the linear program, the tighter linear program was resolved. This procedure was iterated until either of the following conditions was satisfied: (i) no violated constraints could be generated by the separation procedures, (ii) the current lower bound of the enumeration tree was greater or equal to the current upper bound. If no constraints are generated in the separation phase, we create subproblems by branching on a fractional variable. First, we select a fractional  $y_i$  variable, based on the *strong branching* rule ([Achterberg et al. \(2005\)](#)). If all these variables are integers, then we select a fractional  $x_e$  variable using the same rule. As for the node-selection rule, we used the best-first policy for all our computations, *i.e.*, select the subproblem with the lowest objective value.

### 5.1. Preprocessing

In this section, we detail a preprocessing algorithm that enables the reduction of size of the GMDTSP instances whose edge costs satisfy the triangle inequality *i.e.*, for distinct  $i, j, k \in T$ ,  $c_{ij} + c_{jk} \geq c_{ik}$ . A similar algorithm is presented in [Laporte et al. \(1987\)](#); [Bektas et al. \(2011\)](#) for the asymmetric generalized traveling salesman problem and generalized vehicle routing problem respectively. In a GMDTSP instance where the edge costs satisfy the triangle inequality, the optimal solution would visit exactly one target in each cluster. We utilize this structure of the optimal solution and reduce the size of a given GMDTSP instance, if possible. To that end, we define a target  $i \in T$  to be *dominated* if there exists a target  $j \in C_{h(i)}$ ,  $j \neq i$  such that

1.  $c_{pi} + c_{iq} \geq c_{pj} + c_{jq}$  for any  $p, q \in T \setminus C_{h(i)}$ ,
2.  $c_{di} \geq c_{dj}$  for all  $d \in D$ , and
3.  $c_{di} + c_{ip} \geq c_{dj} + c_{jp}$  for any  $d \in D, p \in T \setminus C_{h(i)}$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *If a dominated target is removed from a GMDTSP instance satisfying triangle inequality, then the optimal cost to the instance does not change.*

**Proof** Let  $i \in T$  be a dominated vertex. If the target  $i$  is not visited in the optimal solution, then its removal does not change the optimal cost. So, assume that  $i \in T$  is visited by the optimal solution. Since the edge costs of the instance satisfy the triangle inequality, exactly one target in each cluster is visited by the optimal solution. We now claim that it is possible to exchange the target  $i$  with a target  $j \in C_{h(i)}$  without increasing the cost of the optimal solution. This follows from the definition of a dominated target.  $\square$

The preprocessing checks if a target is dominated and removes the target if it is found so. Then the other targets are checked for dominance relative to the reduced instance. The time complexity of the algorithm is  $O(|T|^5)$ .

### 5.2. LP rounding heuristic

We discuss an *LP-rounding* heuristic that aides to generate feasible solutions at the root node and to speed up the convergence of the branch-and-cut algorithm. The heuristic constructs a feasible GMDTSP solution from a given fractional LP solution. It is used only at the root node of the enumeration tree. The heuristic is based on a transformation method in [Oberlin et al. \(2009\)](#). We are given  $\mathbf{y}^*$ , the vector of fractional  $y_i$  values (denoted by  $y_i^f$ ) for each target  $i$ . The algorithm proceeds as follows: for each cluster  $C_k$  and every target  $i \in C_k$ , the heuristic sets the value of  $y_i$  to 0 or 1 according to the condition  $y_i^f \geq 0.5$  or  $y_i^f < 0.5$  respectively. If every target  $i \in C_k$  has  $y_i^f < 0.5$ , then we set the value of  $y_j = 1$  where  $j = \operatorname{argmax}\{y_i^f : i \in C_k\}$ . Once we have assigned the  $y_i$  value for each target  $i$ , we define the set  $\Pi := \{i \in T : y_i = 1\}$ . We then solve a multiple depot traveling salesman problem (MDTSP) on the set of vertices  $\Pi \cup D$ . A heuristic based on the transformation method in [Oberlin et al. \(2009\)](#) and LKH heuristic (see [Helsgaun \(2000\)](#)) is used to solve the MDTSP.

## 6. Computational results

In this section, we discuss the computational results of the branch-and-cut algorithm. The algorithm was implemented in C++ (gcc version 4.6.3), using the elements of Standard Template Library (STL) in the CPLEX 12.4 framework. As mentioned in [Sec. 5](#), the internal CPLEX cut generation was disabled, and CPLEX was used only to manage the enumeration tree. All the simulations were performed on a Dell Precision T5500 workstation (Inter Xeon E5360 processor @2.53 GHz, 12 GB RAM). The computation times reported are expressed in seconds, and we imposed a time limit of 7200 seconds for each run of the algorithm. The performance of the algorithm was tested on a total of 116 instances, all of which were generated using the generalized traveling salesman problem library (see [Fischetti et al. \(1997\)](#); [Gutin and Karapetyan \(2010\)](#)).

### 6.1. Problem instances

All the computational experiments were conducted on a class of 116 test instances generated from 29 GTSP instances. The GTSP instances are taken directly from the GTSP Instances Library (see [Gutin and Karapetyan \(2010\)](#)). The instances are available at <http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~dxk/gtsp.html>. For each of the 29 instances, GMDTSP instances with  $|D| \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$  were generated by assuming the first  $|D|$  targets in a GTSP instance to be the set of depots; these depots were then removed from the target clusters. The number of targets in the instances varied from 14 to 105, and the maximum number of target clusters was 21. Hence we had 4 GMDTSP instances for each of the 29 GTSP instances totalling to 116 test instances. We also note that for 64/116 instances, the edge costs do not satisfy the triangle inequality and for the remaining 52 instances, the edge costs satisfy the triangle inequality. The name of the generated instances are the same but for a small modification to spell out the number of depots in the instances. The naming conforms to the format `GTSPinstancename-D`, where `GTSPinstancename` corresponds to the GTSP instance name from the library (the first and the last integer in the name corresponds to the number of clusters and the number of targets in the GTSP instance respectively) and `D` corresponds the number of depots in the instance.

The results are tabulated in tables 1 and 2. The following nomenclature is used in the table 1

**name:** problem instance name (format: `GTSPinstancename-D`);

**opt:** optimal objective value;

**LB:** objective value of the LP relaxation computed at the root node of the enumeration tree;

**%LB:** percentage  $LB/opt$ ;

**UB:** cost of the best feasible solution generated by the LP-rounding heuristic generated at the root node of the enumeration tree;

**%UB:** percentage  $UB/opt$ ;

**sec1:** total number of constraints (13) generated;

**sec2:** total number of constraints (14) generated;

**4pec:** total number of constraints (5) generated;

**pec:** total number of constraints (19) and (20) generated;

**comb:** total number of constraints (24), (26), and (27) generated;

**nodes:** total number of nodes examined in the enumeration tree.

The table 2 gives the computational time for each separation routine and the overall the branch-and-cut algorithm. The nomenclature used in table 2 are as follows:

**name:** problem instance name (format: `GTSPinstancename-D`);

**total-t:** CPU time, in seconds, for the overall execution of the branch-and-cut algorithm;

**sep-t**: overall CPU time, in seconds, spent for separation;

**sec-t**: CPU time, in seconds, spent for the separation of constraints (13) and (14);

**4pec-t**: CPU time, in seconds, spent for the separation of constraints (5);

**pec-t**: CPU time, in seconds, spent for the separation of constraints (19) and (20);

**comb-t**: CPU time, in seconds, spent for the separation of constraints (24), (26), and (27);

**%pec**: percentage of separation time spent for the separation of path elimination constraints (19) and (20).

Table 1: Branch-and-cut statistics

name	opt	LB	%LB	UB	%UB	sec1	sec2	4pec	pec	comb	nodes
3burma14-2	1939	1939.00	100.00	1939	100.00	51	8	0	2	0	0
3burma14-3	1664	1664.00	100.00	1664	100.00	11	15	0	2	0	0
3burma14-4	1296	1296.00	100.00	1296	100.00	8	14	0	0	0	0
3burma14-5	562	562.00	100.00	562	100.00	1	20	0	0	0	0
4br17-2	31	31.00	100.00	54	174.19	7	4	0	0	1	3
4br17-3	31	31.00	100.00	31	100.00	7	7	0	0	0	0
4br17-4	19	19.00	100.00	19	100.00	5	14	0	0	0	0
4br17-5	19	19.00	100.00	19	100.00	5	20	0	4	0	0
4gr17-2	958	846.33	88.34	965	100.73	22	187	8	335	0	97
4gr17-3	738	722.88	97.95	794	107.59	3	43	1	53	4	6
4gr17-4	611	611.00	100.00	611	100.00	2	14	0	3	0	0
4gr17-5	513	513.00	100.00	513	100.00	1	25	0	0	0	0
4ulysses16-2	4695	4695.00	100.00	4695	100.00	36	18	0	0	0	0
4ulysses16-3	4695	4695.00	100.00	4695	100.00	53	20	0	0	0	0
4ulysses16-4	4695	4695.00	100.00	4695	100.00	50	27	0	0	0	0
4ulysses16-5	3914	3884.00	99.23	4188	107.00	22	27	0	7	0	3
5gr21-2	1679	1531.67	91.22	1985	118.23	419	367	12	2158	0	449
5gr21-3	1024	1024.00	100.00	1024	100.00	6	32	0	2	0	0
5gr21-4	953	953.00	100.00	953	100.00	9	20	0	1	0	0
5gr21-5	780	780.00	100.00	780	100.00	4	9	0	2	0	0
5gr24-2	377	340.53	90.33	828	219.63	25	169	0	366	0	13
5gr24-3	377	318.00	84.35	569	150.93	37	181	0	524	32	42
5gr24-4	371	325.17	87.65	753	202.96	39	157	8	303	6	26
5gr24-5	362	308.17	85.13	739	204.14	12	99	7	222	0	87
5ulysses22-2	5199	5199.00	100.00	5199	100.00	70	71	2	126	1	0
5ulysses22-3	5311	5310.50	99.99	5442	102.47	45	82	0	1	0	3
5ulysses22-4	5021	5021.00	100.00	5021	100.00	45	39	0	0	0	0
5ulysses22-5	3913	3913.00	100.00	3913	100.00	37	27	0	1	0	0
6bayg29-2	711	624.50	87.83	905	127.29	82	312	0	1526	0	148
6bayg29-3	684	582.50	85.16	841	122.95	70	809	3	3489	28	301
6bayg29-4	583	527.50	90.48	811	139.11	25	91	0	171	7	24
6bayg29-5	565	520.79	92.17	1888	334.16	40	103	0	360	6	21
6bays29-2	849	761.46	89.69	1194	140.64	123	178	0	1466	0	296
6bays29-3	830	777.68	93.70	1092	131.57	80	145	1	959	17	48
6bays29-4	691	650.60	94.15	847	122.58	30	92	3	238	20	6
6bays29-5	622	591.55	95.10	1052	169.13	30	99	1	258	3	10
6fri26-2	480	471.50	98.23	541	112.71	54	184	1	519	0	15
6fri26-3	486	466.00	95.88	510	104.94	167	166	0	1923	3	388
6fri26-4	440	414.57	94.22	446	101.36	92	128	0	355	9	38
6fri26-5	436	411.56	94.39	473	108.49	66	91	2	520	2	41
9dantzig42-2	413	413.00	100.00	413	100.00	114	300	0	0	0	0
9dantzig42-3	351	351.00	100.00	358	101.99	82	328	0	10	1	3
9dantzig42-4	350	345.75	98.79	396	113.14	81	272	1	442	33	6
9dantzig42-5	348	344.29	98.93	348	100.00	82	203	2	346	45	12
10att48-2	4924	4284.05	87.00	5510	111.90	456	945	0	7563	0	268
10att48-3	4913	4539.33	92.39	6054	123.22	177	880	8	10115	154	1406
10att48-4	4428	3980.11	89.89	5685	128.39	197	738	2	8555	138	879
10att48-5	4204	3897.97	92.72	5515	131.18	87	690	9	12826	1077	594

Table 1 – continued from previous page

name	opt	LB	%LB	UB	%UB	sec1	sec2	4pec	pec	comb	nodes
10gr48-2	1708	1707.00	99.94	1708	100.00	88	186	1	259	0	2
10gr48-3	1638	1628.14	99.40	2345	143.16	74	220	4	1011	0	14
10gr48-4	1645	1629.23	99.04	2197	133.56	86	185	0	958	1	33
10gr48-5	1638	1471.48	89.83	2243	136.94	108	405	5	2163	30	179
10hk48-2	6401	6209.83	97.01	6753	105.50	357	418	7	3018	0	82
10hk48-3	5872	5567.49	94.81	6211	105.77	234	364	1	2549	0	75
10hk48-4	5642	5044.00	89.40	6359	112.71	269	474	1	2370	3	69
10hk48-5	5641	5145.17	91.21	6702	118.81	282	399	0	3455	14	27
11berlin52-2	3500	3425.00	97.86	4010	114.57	121	288	0	1	1	17
11berlin52-3	3500	3376.17	96.46	3963	113.23	142	311	1	753	66	20
11berlin52-4	3500	3280.00	93.71	3699	105.69	88	241	1	426	3	25
11berlin52-5	3500	3273.92	93.54	4169	119.11	131	160	0	599	26	26
11eil51-2	175	174.50	99.71	175	100.00	148	522	2	1071	0	3
11eil51-3	174	168.83	97.03	174	100.00	138	269	3	1160	54	11
11eil51-4	175	165.24	94.42	183	104.57	175	273	11	1837	18	74
11eil51-5	170	166.44	97.91	170	100.00	71	214	2	479	6	8
12brazil58-2	14939	14939.00	100.00	14939	100.00	141	278	3	834	0	0
12brazil58-3	14930	14840.50	99.40	15240	102.08	140	298	1	967	57	18
12brazil58-4	13082	12680.46	96.93	16148	123.44	147	397	1	1447	126	40
12brazil58-5	12613	11958.93	94.81	15546	123.25	153	1049	1	583	50	98
14st70-2	304	288.01	94.74	307	100.99	392	576	2	3147	3	81
14st70-3	301	292.57	97.20	312	103.65	313	600	6	2846	12	17
14st70-4	298	287.25	96.39	298	100.00	182	372	4	1404	4	19
14st70-5	298	282.28	94.73	325	109.06	313	670	9	3883	5	163
16eil76-2	198	198.00	100.00	198	100.00	223	436	0	945	0	0
16eil76-3	197	197.00	100.00	197	100.00	174	258	3	727	6	0
16eil76-4	197	197.00	100.00	197	100.00	147	360	4	941	20	0
16eil76-5	188	180.42	95.97	196	104.26	233	386	5	1132	25	27
20gr96-2†	29966	28357.03	94.63	30821	102.85	823	1220	1	3540	0	62
20gr96-3†	29621	29263.93	98.79	30768	103.87	876	1326	2	3382	529	50
20gr96-4	28705	27650.63	96.33	30121	104.93	866	1754	6	4268	7	144
20gr96-5	28598	27768.50	97.10	29976	104.82	676	1269	1	2087	1	52
20kroA100-2	9630	9265.75	96.22	9769	101.44	746	1080	5	3481	0	66
20kroA100-3	9334	8935.25	95.73	9535	102.15	532	915	0	2801	0	92
20kroA100-4	8897	8539.03	95.98	10243	115.13	935	1241	2	4490	0	126
20kroA100-5	8827	8477.39	96.04	9020	102.19	520	1028	4	2480	0	47
20kroB100-2	9800	9492.00	96.86	10382	105.94	510	955	4	3025	0	30
20kroB100-3†	10218	9197.41	90.01	10300	100.80	903	1120	1	5373	0	130
20kroB100-4	9564	9293.31	97.17	9637	100.76	361	714	0	2323	0	20
20kroB100-5	9226	8525.71	92.41	11708	126.90	739	1058	10	7225	0	119
20kroC100-2†	10089	9548.13	94.64	10089	100.00	420	974	0	1551	0	3
20kroC100-3	9244	9130.82	98.78	9346	101.10	494	1006	0	1940	1	8
20kroC100-4	9292	9061.20	97.52	9342	100.54	307	707	2	1132	3	10
20kroC100-5	9252	8991.89	97.19	10437	112.81	380	956	3	2181	0	19
20kroD100-2†	9353	8497.63	90.85	9381	100.30	886	1525	4	3221	6	65
20kroD100-3	8813	8130.12	92.25	11404	129.40	1284	1664	5	11642	24	212
20kroD100-4	8772	8283.74	94.43	8823	100.58	577	1067	11	3230	3	67
20kroD100-5	8677	8233.85	94.89	9247	106.57	478	732	1	3277	0	45
20kroE100-2	9526	9290.65	97.53	10207	107.15	599	1098	7	4461	0	45
20kroE100-3	9262	9153.61	98.83	9854	106.39	612	1048	7	3974	19	26
20kroE100-4	9262	9147.56	98.76	11046	119.26	513	1032	3	3410	4	21
20kroE100-5	9081	8900.07	98.01	9707	106.89	391	925	3	2802	0	32
20rat99-2	505	504.33	99.87	521	103.17	507	951	0	0	0	7
20rat99-3	504	498.23	98.85	543	107.74	528	977	4	1582	1	20
20rat99-4	501	490.67	97.94	515	102.79	958	1259	5	10214	0	2383
20rat99-5	487	477.67	98.08	506	103.90	688	967	4	4320	0	376
20rd100-2†	3459	3380.39	97.73	3714	107.37	742	1406	0	4119	0	42
20rd100-3	3383	3218.89	95.15	3384	100.03	657	1456	2	4238	1	55
20rd100-4	3298	3167.38	96.04	3398	103.03	530	889	2	2651	0	29
20rd100-5	3234	3109.99	96.17	3327	102.88	559	1056	6	4114	1	64
21eil101-2	248	245.41	98.96	255	102.82	387	812	0	1476	0	20

Table 1 – continued from previous page

name	opt	LB	%LB	UB	%UB	sec1	sec2	4pec	pec	comb	nodes
21eil101-3	248	243.04	98.00	267	107.66	570	982	4	2371	6	37
21eil101-4	233	230.2759	98.83	251	107.73	432	629	3	2586	0	15
21eil101-5	232	226.33	97.56	257	110.78	275	527	0	1483	2	16
21lin105-2	8358	8316.43	99.50	8726	104.40	652	1122	0	0	0	16
21lin105-3 <sup>†</sup>	8304	8164.21	98.32	8619	103.79	870	1298	3	25572	22	7103
21lin105-4	7827	7695.17	98.32	8365	106.87	619	941	2	888	12	89
21lin105-5 <sup>†</sup>	8052	7568.64	94.00	8110	100.72	745	1166	1	2419	6	145

<sup>†</sup>optimality was not verified within a time-limit of 7200 seconds.

Table 2: Algorithm computation times

name	total-t	sep-t	sec-t	4pec-t	pec-t	comb-t	%pec
3burma14-2	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.13
3burma14-3	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.68
3burma14-4	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.97
3burma14-5	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.50
4br17-2	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.14
4br17-3	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4br17-4	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4br17-5	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	68.52
4gr17-2	1.16	0.33	0.10	0.00	0.22	0.01	65.71
4gr17-3	0.23	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	74.03
4gr17-4	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4gr17-5	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4ulysses16-2	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.71
4ulysses16-3	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.04
4ulysses16-4	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.93
4ulysses16-5	0.13	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	72.63
5gr21-2	12.89	3.63	1.00	0.00	2.54	0.09	69.98
5gr21-3	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.28
5gr21-4	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.86
5gr21-5	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.81
5gr24-2	1.81	0.45	0.07	0.00	0.38	0.00	84.82
5gr24-3	3.51	0.92	0.18	0.00	0.73	0.01	79.17
5gr24-4	2.89	0.76	0.11	0.00	0.64	0.01	83.80
5gr24-5	1.63	0.38	0.12	0.00	0.25	0.01	65.26
5ulysses22-2	0.77	0.18	0.04	0.00	0.13	0.00	74.26
5ulysses22-3	0.43	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.64
5ulysses22-4	0.18	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75
5ulysses22-5	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.82
6bayg29-2	18.69	4.97	0.73	0.00	4.17	0.08	83.79
6bayg29-3	20.50	5.66	1.31	0.00	4.19	0.15	74.10
6bayg29-4	1.26	0.31	0.06	0.00	0.24	0.01	77.32
6bayg29-5	1.19	0.27	0.08	0.00	0.18	0.01	68.11
6bays29-2	21.40	6.19	0.96	0.00	5.14	0.08	83.16
6bays29-3	10.60	2.78	0.33	0.00	2.43	0.02	87.50
6bays29-4	1.22	0.30	0.05	0.00	0.24	0.01	80.74
6bays29-5	0.97	0.22	0.04	0.00	0.18	0.00	79.98
6fri26-2	5.55	1.34	0.12	0.00	1.22	0.01	90.53
6fri26-3	18.32	5.55	1.11	0.00	4.31	0.13	77.68
6fri26-4	3.75	0.92	0.12	0.00	0.78	0.01	85.23
6fri26-5	3.26	0.83	0.12	0.00	0.70	0.01	84.67
9dantzig42-2	1.07	0.28	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.38
9dantzig42-3	1.26	0.34	0.16	0.00	0.18	0.00	51.77
9dantzig42-4	5.15	1.29	0.22	0.00	1.05	0.01	81.81
9dantzig42-5	7.97	1.93	0.20	0.00	1.71	0.01	88.71
10att48-2	280.75	80.02	6.73	0.00	72.88	0.41	91.08
10att48-3	243.27	71.62	9.29	0.00	60.66	1.67	84.70
10att48-4	203.20	59.39	7.56	0.00	50.63	1.19	85.26

Table 2 – continued from previous page

name	total-t	sep-t	sec-t	4pec-t	pec-t	comb-t	%pec
10att48-5	130.36	38.93	5.95	0.00	31.74	1.23	81.55
10gr48-2	9.25	2.26	0.21	0.00	2.04	0.01	90.50
10gr48-3	31.81	7.87	0.54	0.00	7.30	0.03	92.72
10gr48-4	39.36	9.62	0.60	0.00	8.96	0.06	93.10
10gr48-5	43.79	11.76	1.39	0.00	10.17	0.20	86.48
10hk48-2	273.81	69.58	3.29	0.00	66.15	0.14	95.07
10hk48-3	170.99	43.05	1.76	0.00	41.19	0.10	95.66
10hk48-4	35.98	9.64	1.04	0.00	8.51	0.09	88.28
10hk48-5	92.75	24.49	1.57	0.00	22.84	0.08	93.27
11berlin52-2	2.28	1.06	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.37
11berlin52-3	67.95	16.48	0.95	0.00	15.48	0.05	93.91
11berlin52-4	27.96	7.19	0.44	0.00	6.72	0.04	93.41
11berlin52-5	19.57	5.17	0.46	0.00	4.66	0.05	90.16
11eil51-2	200.63	48.72	1.39	0.00	47.29	0.03	97.08
11eil51-3	100.95	24.48	0.98	0.00	23.47	0.03	95.85
11eil51-4	142.50	37.00	1.94	0.00	34.95	0.11	94.45
11eil51-5	33.19	8.25	0.36	0.00	7.87	0.02	95.42
12brazil58-2	33.00	7.94	0.96	0.00	6.95	0.03	87.51
12brazil58-3	56.51	13.29	0.93	0.00	12.31	0.06	92.60
12brazil58-4	32.61	8.62	1.00	0.00	7.53	0.09	87.35
12brazil58-5	3.48	1.06	0.52	0.00	0.44	0.10	41.55
14st70-2	876.36	222.60	6.73	0.00	215.47	0.39	96.80
14st70-3	1071.01	264.38	4.16	0.00	260.10	0.12	98.38
14st70-4	354.16	87.56	1.86	0.00	85.61	0.08	97.78
14st70-5	429.46	113.03	5.51	0.00	106.96	0.57	94.63
16eil76-2	160.97	38.04	1.72	0.00	36.27	0.04	95.36
16eil76-3	71.48	17.47	0.80	0.00	16.64	0.03	95.24
16eil76-4	173.67	43.19	1.11	0.00	42.03	0.05	97.31
16eil76-5	274.12	69.50	1.87	0.00	67.52	0.12	97.15
20gr96-2 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	1901.87	44.02	0.00	1857.29	0.56	97.66
20gr96-3 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	1862.37	38.38	0.00	1823.22	0.77	97.90
20gr96-4	5467.42	1428.08	48.45	0.00	1378.35	1.28	96.52
20gr96-5	6495.00	1643.50	35.00	0.00	1607.79	0.71	97.83
20kroA100-2	4291.87	1091.52	22.62	0.00	1068.47	0.42	97.89
20kroA100-3	4225.89	1060.29	14.82	0.00	1044.91	0.56	98.55
20kroA100-4	5057.47	1300.82	28.19	0.00	1271.60	1.04	97.75
20kroA100-5	6368.98	1606.81	20.13	0.00	1585.98	0.70	98.70
20kroB100-2	3389.43	841.28	12.24	0.00	828.79	0.25	98.52
20kroB100-3 <sup>†</sup>	7200.04	1838.03	33.81	0.00	1803.14	1.08	98.10
20kroB100-4	3120.43	778.88	9.44	0.00	769.15	0.29	98.75
20kroB100-5	3397.49	883.26	24.75	0.00	857.50	1.01	97.08
20kroC100-2 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	1821.34	15.18	0.00	1805.91	0.25	99.15
20kroC100-3	3052.62	747.14	10.82	0.00	736.09	0.23	98.52
20kroC100-4	1009.37	250.86	4.82	0.00	245.88	0.16	98.01
20kroC100-5	2839.31	713.70	11.93	0.00	701.39	0.38	98.28
20kroD100-2 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	1852.91	33.91	0.00	1818.46	0.54	98.14
20kroD100-3	6287.9	1671.43	50.47	0.00	1619.66	1.30	96.90
20kroD100-4	4716.98	1190.26	18.79	0.00	1170.92	0.55	98.38
20kroD100-5	2669.25	671.32	13.10	0.00	657.78	0.44	97.98
20kroE100-2	4718.14	1204.19	24.14	0.00	1179.63	0.41	97.96
20kroE100-3	4737.91	1147.37	24.29	0.00	1122.59	0.49	97.84
20kroE100-4	2624.53	641.08	17.04	0.00	623.69	0.35	97.29
20kroE100-5	1892.52	476.91	10.32	0.00	466.24	0.35	97.76
20rat99-2	65.57	12.65	12.55	0.00	0.02	0.09	0.15
20rat99-3	2416.98	583.46	14.15	0.00	569.01	0.30	97.52
20rat99-4	6091.56	1414.13	140.03	0.00	1245.85	28.26	88.10
20rat99-5	3165.79	747.76	46.84	0.00	693.47	7.45	92.74
20rd100-2 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	1846.05	37.12	0.00	1808.40	0.52	97.96
20rd100-3	3815.24	969.42	23.26	0.00	945.69	0.47	97.55
20rd100-4	3273.97	826.82	16.76	0.00	809.60	0.46	97.92
20rd100-5	2513.41	643.81	15.04	0.00	628.22	0.55	97.58

Table 2 – continued from previous page

name	total-t	sep-t	sec-t	4pec-t	pec-t	comb-t	%pec
21eil101-2	2100.39	519.56	10.63	0.00	508.75	0.19	97.92
21eil101-3	4245.95	1069.99	18.31	0.00	1051.25	0.43	98.25
21eil101-4	906.82	227.88	7.48	0.00	220.15	0.25	96.61
21eil101-5	682.82	172.40	4.07	0.00	168.13	0.19	97.52
21lin105-2	86.33	21.14	20.93	0.00	0.03	0.18	0.15
21lin105-3 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	2047.88	380.14	0.00	1566.72	101.02	76.50
21lin105-4	3609.22	903.74	19.51	0.00	883.49	0.74	97.76
21lin105-5 <sup>†</sup>	7200.00	1890.67	45.87	0.00	1843.24	1.56	97.49

<sup>†</sup>optimality was not verified within a time-limit of 7200 seconds.

The results indicate that the proposed branch-and-cut algorithm can solve instances involving up to 105 targets with modest computation times. The preprocessing algorithm in Sec. 5.1 was applied to 53/116 instances. The time taken by the preprocessing algorithm is not included in the overall computation time. The preprocessing algorithm reduced the size of these instances by 6 targets on average and the maximum reduction obtained was 14 targets. We observe that the instances that have a larger number of violated path elimination constraints take considerably large amount of computation time. The last column in table 2, whose average is 73%, indicates the percentage of separation time spent for finding violated path elimination constraints. This is not surprising because the time complexity for identifying violated path elimination constraints in (19) and (20) given a fractional solution, is  $O(|T|^5)$  and  $O(m|T|^4)$  respectively. The average number of T-comb inequalities that were generated in the enumeration tree were larger for some of the bigger instances (see table 1). They were effective, especially in tightening the lower bound for the instances that were not solved to optimality; for the instances where violated T-comb inequalities were separated out, the average linear programming relaxation gap improvement was 18%. They were also useful in reducing the computation times for larger instances despite increasing the computation times for smaller instances. Overall, we were able to solve 108/116 instances to the optimality with the largest instance involving 105 targets, 21 clusters and 5 depots. The “**opt**” column for the remaining 6/116 instances is the cost of the best feasible solution obtained by the branch-and-cut algorithm at the end of 7200 seconds. For the instances not solved to optimality within the time limit of 7200 seconds, the LP-rounding heuristic was effective in generating feasible solutions within 2.1% of the best feasible solution, on average.

## 7. Conclusion

In summary, we have presented an exact algorithm for the GMDTSP, a problem that has several practical applications including maritime transportation, health-care logistics, survivable telecommunication network design, and routing unmanned vehicles to name a few. A mixed-integer linear programming formulation including several classes of valid inequalities was proposed the facial structure of the polytope of feasible solutions was studied in detail. All the results were used to develop a branch-and-cut algorithm whose performance was corroborated through extensive numerical experiments on a wide range of benchmark

instances from the standard library. The largest solved instance involved 105 targets, 21 clusters and 4 depots. Future work can be directed towards development of branch-and-cut approaches accompanied with a polyhedral study to solve the asymmetric counterpart of the problem.

## References

### References

- Tobias Achterberg, Thorsten Koch, and Alexander Martin. Branching rules revisited. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 33(1):42–54, January 2005. ISSN 0167-6377.
- Joaquín Bautista, Elena Fernández, and Jordi Pereira. Solving an urban waste collection problem using ants heuristics. *Computers & Operations Research*, 35(9):3020–3033, 2008.
- Tolga Bektas, Günes Erdogan, and Stefan Røpke. Formulations and branch-and-cut algorithms for the generalized vehicle routing problem. *Transportation Science*, 45(3):299–316, 2011.
- José-Manuel Belenguer, Enrique Benavent, Christian Prins, Caroline Prodhon, and Roberto Wolfer Calvo. A branch-and-cut method for the capacitated location-routing problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 38(6):931–941, June 2011.
- Enrique Benavent and Antonio Martínez. Multi-depot multiple TSP: a polyhedral study and computational results. *Ann Oper Res*, 207(1):7–25, August 2013.
- Václav Chvátal. Edmonds polytopes and weakly hamiltonian graphs. *Mathematical Programming*, 5(1):29–40, 1973.
- Dominique Feillet, Pierre Dejax, and Michel Gendreau. Traveling salesman problems with profits. *Transportation science*, 39(2):188–205, 2005.
- Matteo Fischetti, Juan José Salazar González, and Paolo Toth. The symmetric generalized traveling salesman polytope. *Networks*, 26(2):113–123, 1995.
- Matteo Fischetti, Juan Jose Salazar Gonzalez, and Paolo Toth. A branch-and-cut algorithm for the symmetric generalized traveling salesman problem. *Operations Research*, 45(3):378–394, 1997.
- Gianpaolo Ghiani and Gennaro Improta. An efficient transformation of the generalized vehicle routing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 122(1):11–17, 2000.
- Martin Grötschel and M. W. Padberg. Polyhedral theory. *The traveling salesman problem*, pages 251–305, 1985.
- Gregory Gutin and Daniel Karapetyan. A memetic algorithm for the generalized traveling salesman problem. *Natural Computing*, 9(1):47–60, 2010.
- Keld Helsgaun. An effective implementation of the lin-kernighan traveling salesman heuristic. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 126(1):106–130, 2000.
- IBM ILOG CPLEX. ILOG CPLEX. *ILOG CPLEX 12.4 Advanced Reference Manual*, 2012.
- Henry AL Labordere. Record balancing problem—a dynamic programming solution of a generalized traveling salesman problem. *Revue Francaise D Informatique De Recherche Operationnelle*, 3(NB 2):43, 1969.
- G. Laporte, Y. Nobert, and D. Arpin. An exact algorithm for solving a capacitated location-routing problem. *Ann Oper Res*, 6(9):291–310, September 1986.
- Gilbert Laporte. Location routing problems. 1987.
- Gilbert Laporte, Hélène Mercure, and Yves Nobert. Generalized traveling salesman problem through  $n$  sets of nodes: the asymmetrical case. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 18(2):185–197, 1987.
- Gilbert Laporte, Ardavan Asef-Vaziri, and Chelliah Srisankarajah. Some applications of the generalized traveling salesman problem. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, pages 1461–1467, 1996.
- Satyanarayana G Manyam, Sivakumar Rathinam, Swaroop Darbha, David Casbeer, and Phil Chandler. Routing of two unmanned aerial vehicles with communication constraints. In *Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS), 2014 International Conference on*, pages 140–148. IEEE, 2014.
- Charles Edward Noon and James C Bean. An efficient transformation of the generalized traveling salesman problem. *Ann Arbor*, 1001:48109–2117, 1989.
- Paul Oberlin, Sivakumar Rathinam, and Swaroop Darbha. A transformation for a heterogeneous, multiple depot, multiple traveling salesman problem. In *American Control Conference, 2009. ACC'09.*, pages 1292–1297. IEEE, 2009.
- Paul Oberlin, Sivakumar Rathinam, and Swaroop Darbha. Today’s travelling salesman: Depot, multiple uav routing problem. *IEEE robotics & automation magazine*, 17(4):70–77, 2010.
- Manfred W Padberg. A Note on Zero-One Programming. *Operations Research*, 23(4):833–837, 1975.

- Manfred W Padberg and M Ram Rao. Odd minimum cut-sets and b-matchings. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 7(1):67–80, 1982.
- SS Srivastava, Santosh Kumar, RC Garg, and Prasenjit Sen. Generalized traveling salesman problem through n sets of nodes. *CORS journal*, 7:97–101, 1969.
- Kaarthik Sundar and Sivakumar Rathinam. Multiple depot ring star problem: A polyhedral study and exact algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.5080*, 2014.